



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

YAHUDA'S EDITION OF BAḤYA'S 'DUTIES OF THE HEART'

Al-Hidāja 'ilā Farā'id al-Qulūb des Baḥja Ibn Josef Ibn Paḳūda aus Andalusien im arabischen Urtext zum ersten Male nach der Oxforder und Pariser Handschrift sowie den Petersburger Fragmenten herausgegeben von Dr. A. S. YAHUDA. Buchhandlung und Druckerei vormals E. J. BRILL. Leiden, 1912. pp. xviii + 113 + 9.v (text).

BAḤYA B. JOSEPH IBN PAḲŪDA is not to be counted among the Judaeo-Arabic philosophers of the classic period (900-1200). His Arabic work under the title given above, the only one through which he became known to posterity, does not represent any system of philosophy, as do the speculative writings of Saadia, Ibn Gabirol, Ibn Dāūd, and Maimonides. It is only the first chapter of the work, which, dealing with the question of God's unity, gives the whole a philosophic aspect. But even here the author is not actuated by the desire of solving for the reader a philosophic problem, but merely follows a custom common among Moham-medan theologians of opening their books with a chapter on God, emphasizing His unity and uniqueness, and proving these by arguments borrowed from the works of the philosophers. Baḥya's chapter on Unity is, indeed, only a restatement of theories taken from Saadia's *Kitāb al-Amānāt*, whom he mentions several times and whose views he often utilizes without explicitly referring to his source. In the Introduction (p. 25, l. 15 ff.) Baḥya himself declares that he does not propose to deal with 'deep problems (المطالب البعيدة) the solution of which would be difficult in a work like his'. Elsewhere in the work (p. 191, l. 19; 361, l. 8) he even expresses his disapproval of all speculative attempts to penetrate the secrets of existence, its origin and final goal—problems whose solution, he says, is beyond the power of human

understanding. What he intends is to furnish to the reader a work which shall serve him as a methodical guide in all questions pertaining to his moral conscience and his inward relation to God. To achieve this purpose he does not confine himself to the quotation and interpretation of the material found in Jewish sources, but makes extensive use of his vast knowledge of the literature of the Arabs, from which he quotes a large number of fine sayings, anecdotes, and philosophic sentences, each one conveying some moral lesson of high value. In brief, Bahya does not direct himself to the *mind* of the reader, he does not try to enlighten him on intricate metaphysical problems, but wishes to touch his *heart*, to stir his sentiments, and to elevate his soul to the realm of a higher contemplative life.

To edit a work like the *Hidāya* and to give to the reader a proper analysis and appreciation of its contents, it is not sufficient that the editor possess a knowledge of the Arabic idiom and be conversant with the rabbinical literature upon which the author has so frequently drawn. In the entire branch of Judæo-Arabic literature there is hardly any other work of equal importance that is so thoroughly Mohammedan in style and diction and so completely permeated by the spirit of Muslim theology as is this ethical work of Bahya. Were it not for the numerous quotations from Bible and Talmud, the work might reasonably be taken as the product of some Arabic moralist, like Ġazzālī and others. A proper understanding of Bahya's Ethics, therefore, necessarily requires the most intimate knowledge of the classic Arabic literature in its various branches, as the so-called *Adab* (*litterae humaniores*)-, *Kalām* (doctrinal theology)-, *Zuhd* (asceticism)-, and especially the wide Ḥadīth (traditions)- and Ṣūfī (mystic)-literature.

This being the case, we must consider it good fortune that our work came into the hands of an editor who better than any one of the younger European Arabists satisfies the requirements just described. Born and brought up in the Orient (Bagdad), with Arabic as his native tongue and ancient Hebrew and Muslim literature as the main sources of his education, later broadened by studies at

European universities, Dr. Yahuda was exceptionally fitted for the edition of Bahya's work. Already in 1904 he published *Prolegomena zu einer erstmaligen Herausgabe des Kitāb al-hiddja 'ila farā'id al-qulūb*, in which he treated exhaustively of the history and importance of the text, the peculiarities of the MSS., their relation to one another, etc., promising to take up some other aspects of the work in connexion with the future edition. In the work that is now before us, Dr. Yahuda more than makes good his promise. The Arabic text, to which Bahya's famous Hebrew Exhortation (תוֹכַחָה) and Supplication (בִּקְשָׁה) are added, is based upon two complete MSS. (Oxford and Paris) and several fragments in the St. Petersburg Imperial Library, all written in Hebrew characters, which Yahuda has transliterated into Arabic, in order, as he says (p. 17), to make the work accessible also to modern Mohammedan scholars of the Orient. Transliterations from one script into another are usually the cause of mistakes, no matter how carefully done. This is due to the circumstance that the scribes, who copied the MSS. either for themselves or for others, employed the Hebrew alphabet in such a manner as to reproduce the sound of the Arabic words in the pronunciation to which they were accustomed; and, while on the whole a certain regularity was generally observed, there is still enough left that is more or less arbitrary and requires special knowledge (comp. Yahuda's detailed discussion of this matter in the afore-mentioned *Prolegomena*, 23 ff.). Indeed, as an English critic has pointed out (*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1914, p. 105 ff.), even Yahuda with his mastery of Arabic did not entirely escape the traps laid by the scribes. Most of the mistakes, however, are of little significance, being due partly to misprints and partly to the fact mentioned by the editor (p. 16, n. 1) that Jewish as well as Mohammedan authors very often showed carelessness in grammar and orthography and sometimes even in the construction of sentences, the correction of which is not within the province of the editor.

Dr. Yahuda also had another difficulty to cope with, namely, that in very numerous places the MSS. offer widely different texts. In the first chapter of the work we have in part two

entirely different recensions. The editor's assumption (pp. 14-15) that the recension represented by the Paris MS. is the work of later readers and copyists will, in spite of the plausible arguments adduced in favour of this view, hardly gain the approval of scholars. Bahya is no doubt the author of both versions. Such double texts are not a rare occurrence in Arabic literature (comp. Goldziher, *ZDMG.*, LXVII, 530), and they are in most cases attributable to the authors themselves. A classic example in Judaeo-Arabic literature is the seventh chapter of Saadia's *Kitāb al-Amānāt*, which exists in two totally different versions (see Bacher in the Steinschneider-*Festschrift*, pp. 219-26). In Bahya's work as well as in the *Amānāt* even the minor differences between the existing MSS., as they occur throughout the respective works, are not merely variants caused by the copyists, but in most instances go back to changes made by the authors themselves.

Be that as it may, the main distinction of Yahuda's edition is not so much his treatment of the text as his excellent introduction to the work. It consists of three main chapters, each one subdivided into several sections. The first chapter (pp. 1-18) is devoted to a minute description of the MSS. and other technicalities of the edition. A thorough examination of the method and the scientific value of Judah Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation of Bahya's work occupies the second chapter of Yahuda's introduction (pp. 19-52). Numerous passages throughout that translation are pointed out as inadequate renderings of the original and are replaced by translations into Hebrew suggested by the editor. On several occasions (see pp. 35, 43-47) considerable portions of the text are thus retranslated into Hebrew or omissions by Ibn Tibbon restored. It should here be stated that some of Yahuda's substitutions will not be accepted as an improvement upon Ibn Tibbon. Thus for example מאמרים (p. 34) is not equivalent to شَوَاقُّ الْحَدِيثِ; read מאמרים זרים P. 44, l. 2: The Arabic وَفُتِيَعُ الْهَمَّةِ, people of low desires, cares or ambitions, is fairly well rendered by Ibn Tibbon's נפשם שפלה (see *Abot*, V, 19), while Yahuda's עצמתו שפלה is unintelligible.

Ibn Tibbon's לְבוֹתָם may not be a literal translation of فَرَاغَهُם, otium, leisure, but it certainly expresses Bahya's idea better than the literal רִיקֵנוֹת of the editor (p. 44, l. 5). המסכתפך במספיק ממנו is a slavish but more correct translation of القانع بِكَفِّهَا than מי נִשְׂבַּח יְדוֹ שִׁמְחָה (p. 45, l. 3); a noun מִשְׂחָה does not exist. That Ibn Tibbon put העובר אִתּוֹ for لها الساعي (*ibid.*, n. 8) is quite improbable and the reading of the editions: העובר seems to be correct, meaning he who in enjoying worldly goods goes beyond that which is necessary for the sustenance of life. This meaning, like that supposed by Yahuda, is not warranted, however, by the Arabic text, as the equivalent of which we should expect רֵץ אֱלֹהֵי (comp. Isa. 59. 7; *Abot*, IV, 2). The phrase שְׂאֵלָתוֹ לְמוֹדִים for שְׂאֵלָתוֹ (p. 46, l. 3) is less accurate than Ibn Tibbon's שְׂאֵלָתוֹ, i.e. the pious man's question is in order to learn, not in order to embarrass. The imitation of Bahya's rhyme is here quite immaterial. Untenable is the phrase immediately following وَلَيَقِيَنَّ عَزْمَهُ for עֲצָמָתוֹ כְּבִירָה, he is firm in his decision. Ibn Tibbon's חֻקָּהּ הַסְבֵּכָתוֹ is certainly better. The proper equivalent would be הַחֲלָטָתוֹ חֻקָּהּ. For אֵינוֹ קֶשֶׁה (*ibid.*, l. 6) read אֵינוֹ נָם; the word נָם is not construed with לְ, nor is it used in the sense here required.

The most valuable part of the introduction is the third chapter (pp. 53–113), which deals with the Mohammedan sources drawn upon by Bahya. Here, to use a rabbinical phrase, Dr. Yahuda is כְּאֶדָם הַעוֹשֶׂה בְּתוֹךְ שָׂלוֹ, 'like one who tills his own soil'. His exceptional knowledge of classic Arabic literature and his familiarity with the specific idioms and technical phrases used by the different theological schools in order to designate certain trains of thought which were common and understood only among their disciples, enable him to throw new light on many passages, which would otherwise not be fully understood even in the Arabic original and still less in Ibn Tibbon's translation. One instance will suffice for illustration. In describing the *Zāhid* (pious, abstinent person) Bahya says of him (*Hidāya*, IX, 4) that he is مُتَحَالِطٌ لِلْأَهْلِ الذِّكْرِ, literally, 'he associates with people of remembrance', which Ibn Tibbon renders by חֶבֶר לְמוֹכִירִים. The idea

becomes clear when we are shown (p. 47, n. 5 ; 98, n. 1) that in Mohammedan sources *اهل الذكر* designates pious Moslems, who assemble regularly for common prayers, during which they repeatedly invoke (remember) God with the phrase *لا اله الا الله*, there is no God besides Allah.

A special feature of Baḥya's work consists, as has already been noted, in the numerous quotations from the works of the Arabs of beautiful ethical and philosophical sentences, parables, and anecdotes, which lend particular charm to the author's expositions. These quotations, numbering over a hundred, are all anonymous, and no systematic attempt has yet been made to trace them to their respective sources. Yahuda for the first time undertakes this rather difficult task. Leaving out general applications of phrases, figures of speech, parables, etc. of the Korân, New Testament, and other sources, which are too numerous to be considered in detail (comp. p. 69 f., 77, n. 1 ; 82, n. 2), he takes up only the direct quotations, which are usually introduced by the phrase 'said one of the worthies, one of the pious, the wise men', and identifies their respective authors, or at least shows parallels in Mohammedan literature.

It is not within my province to enter upon a detailed analysis of this part of Yahuda's work. I wish to add, however, a few remarks, which have a close bearing upon the subject and may prove of some value to those interested in Judæo-Arabic literature. In the first place it should be stated that the Hebrew quotation in the name of 'one of the worthies' (*Hidāya*, IV, 6, end) is taken from Saadia's famous prayer, beginning *לה' לברך* (published in *נאונים קדמונים* by Judah Rosenberg, Berlin, 1856, pp. 74-7 ; the passage is on p. 76, l. 29 ff. ; comp. Dukes, *נחל קדומים*, 26, 42 ; Landshuth, *עמודי העבודה*, 293). In Baḥya's quotation the passage is given more fully and correctly and the prayer ought to be corrected accordingly. Dr. Yahuda, likewise, passes over in silence the interesting reference to a pious man who used to say in his prayer 'O Lord ! where shall I find Thee and where shall I not find Thee ! Thou art hidden and invisible and yet the whole universe is full of Thee' (*Hidāya*, I, 10, p. 82, l. 7 f. ;

Hobot, ed. Jellinek-Benjacob, p. 81). This is essentially identical with the beginning of Judah Halewi's famous poem for Simḥat Torah: **יה אנה אמצאך מקומך נעלה ונעלה ואנה לא אמצאך כבודך** (ed. Brody, III, 2, No. 82). Did Baḥya have Judah Halewi in mind? It should also be noted that Baḥya's comparison of those who learn the text of the Bible by heart, without attempting to comprehend its meaning, to 'an ass carrying books' (**חמור חמור חמור**; *Hidāya*, III, 4, p. 144, l. 5; ed. Jellinek, p. 150) is a popular proverb found in the works of contemporary and later authors. Abraham Ibn Ezra (**יסוד מורא**, ch. 1) has 'a camel carrying *silḥ*', while Nahmanides (Intro. to Maimonides' **המצות** (ס') and Menaḥem Meiri (see Dukes in **אוצר נחמד**, II, 114) agree with Baḥya.

Dr. Yahuda often goes too far in his identification of Arabic dicta with some passages of the Talmud. Thus the sentence attributed to Lokmān (Balaam) in Honein's *Nawādir al-Falāsifa* (**מוסרי הפילוסופים**, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1896), II, 12, No. 3, has nothing in common with **אדם נכר בנוסו ובכיסו ובכעסו** (b. Erubin 65 b), as claimed by the editor (p. 54, n. 2). The sentence is found almost verbatim in **מבחר הפנינים**, end of § 43, and forms § 121 in the **ספר חסידים** (ed. Berlin) of Judah Ḥasid, who would certainly not have failed to recognize in it the Talmudic passage, if there was any relation between the two; comp. also Steinschneider, *Hebräische Bibliographie*, IX, 51. Similarly unfounded is the identification in the same note of *Musre* (so, not *Musāre*, as Yahuda quotes repeatedly), II, 12, No. 19 (**אל תתהדר**) with the rabbinic phrase **כבודו של אדם לעלות במקום גדולים** (etc.), with the rabbinic phrase **מקומו**. The former is a free reproduction of Prov. 26. 6-7. P. 55, n. 1, the author might have mentioned that Ibn Ḥisdai himself in his introduction to **מאזני צדק** explains to the reader the reason that made him substitute Jewish sources for those used by Ḡazzālī; comp. *JQR.*, 1910, p. 160, n. 15. The comparison of the human body to a house inhabited by the soul (p. 71, bottom) is a frequent occurrence in the works of mediaeval authors, e. g. Joseph Ibn Šiddīq, **עולם קטן** (Breslau, 1903), p. 33, top; 42, l. 8; Abraham Ibn Ezra, Introduction to the Commentary on Ecclesiastes

who quotes for it Daniel 2. 11; Shem Tob Palquera, מִבְּקֶשׁ, (The Hague, 1777, p. 47 a; comp. my essay on the subject, *JQR.*, 1912, pp. 459, 463, n. 26. The theory that the Greeks and other nations took their wisdom from the Jews is very widely spread in Jewish as well as Christian mediaeval literature, especially in the works of the Church-Fathers, who probably took it from Philo. The idea is thus much older than Moses Ibn Ezra, referred to by Yahuda, p. 73, n. 2. In a note, *JQR.*, 1910, p. 167, I have given numerous references to the literature, to which may here be added: Simon Duran, מִנְּחֵן אֲבוֹת, Leghorn, 1785, fol. 30 a, who discusses the matter at considerable length; Guttman, *Die Religionsphilosophie des Abraham Ibn Daud*, p. 53, note.

A strange mistake was made by the editor in connexion with his statement that many Islāmic *Traditions* (Ḥadit) have their origin in Talmud and Midrash (p. 74, n. 1). He quotes an article on the subject by the late Prof. Barth (*Berliner-Festschrift*, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1903, pp. 33-40), where we are supposed to read that 'Abdallah b. Salām, a Jewish convert to Islām, described the Jews to Mohammed as 'a hasty, thoughtless people' (قَوْمٌ بُهْمَتٌ), a phrase which, as Yahuda properly remarks, is used with reference to the Jews also in the Talmud (עֲמָא פִּזְיָא, b. Shabbat 88 a). Yahuda, no doubt, took the whole matter from some other source, probably Al-Boḥari, as there is no trace of it in the article of Barth. He further misunderstood another passage which he quotes in the same note from that article. 'Abdallah b. Salām, before embracing Islām, is reported to have tested Mohammed's prophetic qualities by placing before him three questions, one of which was: 'Whereof consists the first meal served to the righteous upon their entering Paradise?' Mohammed answered that it consists of the 'caul of the liver of a fish' (زِيَادَةُ الْكَبِدِ). Partly on the strength of this answer 'Abdallah is said to have recognized Mohammed as a prophet and accepted Islām. Yahuda, in interpreting the story, thinks that the convincing force in Mohammed's reply was his use of the phrase just quoted, which, according to Yahuda, is a Hebraism corresponding to the Biblical יוֹתֵרֶת הַכֶּבֶד (Exod. 29. 22, and *passim*)

and of which Mohammed could know only by divine inspiration. It is evident, however, from the context (see Barth, *ibid.*, p. 35, No. 2), that the Jewish element in the Prophet's answer was not the use of the word *ziyadah* (not *zaidah*, as Yahuda has it), but the mentioning of the *fish*, which was in strange harmony with a rabbinic tradition, according to which God is to prepare a meal for the righteous of Israel from the meat of the (fish) Leviathan (Baba batra, 75 a : לעשות סעודה לצדיקים עתיד הקב"ה (מבשרו של לויתן). As to the word *يَاكُنْ*, it should be noted that it is used for *יותרת* in all the passages where the latter occurs in the Bible, so by Saadia and Hefes b. Yaşliah (*JQR.*, 1915, p. 374, l. 2), and also in the recent Christian Arabic translations of the Bible. In connexion with the subject of Haggadic elements in Islâm reference may be made to an interesting Midrash (Genesis Rabba, ch. 20, § 12) quoted by Goldziher from the works of the 'Iḥwân al-ṣafâ (*REJ.*, XLVII, 46); comp. also Grünbaum, *ZDMG.*, XLII, (1888) 291-4.

The sentence *איווה נבור הכובש את יצרו* *Abot*, IV, 1), which is attributed by Ġazzâlî (*Mukāshafat*, p. 9) to Mohammed, is quoted by the same author also in his *Mizān al-'amal*, p. 61, l. 10 f., which is overlooked by Yahuda, p. 74, n. 2. Here the sentence reads *الشديد من ملك نفسه عند الغضب*, and the author does not quote the verse from Prov. 16. 32, which, however, is added by Ibn Hisdai, *מאני צדק*, p. 67. Ġazzâlî's exposition in this place is the source of Ibn 'Aḳnin, *ספר מוסר*, p. 108. Like Ġazzâlî, he there compares the cognitive soul to a hunter and the spirited soul to the hunter's dog, who assists his master in running down the game; comp. *Kuzari*, III, 5. The whole idea is of Platonic origin.

The two sentences discussed by Yahuda on p. 79 and p. 92, of which the first is generally ascribed to Jesus and the second to 'Alî, the son-in-law of Mohammed, or also to Jesus, should have been treated together as one. Though they differ in form, they both express the same idea, which is no doubt of Hindoo origin, as are some other sentences which were ascribed to Jesus (see Yahuda, p. 80 f.). In its epigrammatic form the sentence

occurs in the Hindoo romance 'Prince and Dervish', in Hebrew, *בן המלך והנזיר*, ch. 14, where it reads: 'This world and the world to come are like two women rivals; if you show love to the one, you provoke the other'. The moral lesson the sentence intends to convey is that one should not indulge in worldly pleasures, as they will inevitably make him neglect his religious duties. Essentially the same thought is contained in the more prosaic sentence quoted on p. 79: 'Said 'Isâ (Jesus), son of Maryam (Mary), it is impossible that the love of this world and of the future world dwell as one in the heart of the believer, just as it is impossible for fire and water to be together in one vessel'. In mediaeval Hebrew literature both sentences occur in a variety of forms, also in rhyme (Palquera, *מבקש*, 8 a; *JQR.*, 1910, p. 158, n. 10), all of which, including that of the New Testament (James 4. 4), go back to an early common source. My previous assumption that Ġazzâlî was here the source of Baḥya (*JQR.*, 1911-12, p. 470) accordingly loses in probability. Ġazzâlî, *Mizân*, 147; *מאזני*, 157, has besides the comparison to two women rivals (*כִּפְתִּי מִזָּנַן*), also that to the two scales of the balance (*מִזָּנַן*) and to East and West, and there is no obvious reason why Baḥya should have omitted these points. On the other hand, he agrees literally with the sources quoted by Yahuda, p. 92, nn. 1-3.

In the discussion of the phrase *جعلت معبودك نفسك* (p. 85, n. 1), 'thou hast made thyself the object of thy worship', one misses a reference to *Hidāya*, IX, 2, p. 359, l. 4; *Hobot*, ed. Jellinek-Benjacob, p. 404: *עושים במניהם אלהיהם*, which tallies better with the quotation in *Mizân* 59, 5; 62, 5 (comp. Yahuda, 45, 6).

The sentence in *Hidāya*, VI, 5, beginning, regarding the filthy origin of man, which is traced to 'Abû Bakr, the first Caliph (p. 88, n. 4), is quite popular in the works of mediaeval Hebrew authors; see the references given by Ginzberg, *הצופה מארץ חר*, III (1913), 124; Goldziher, *ZDMG.*, LXVII (1913), 533.

'Mohammed is said to have fixed the ways of belief at seventy' (p. 89, n. 3). In the passage, *Mizân*, 42, 4, which is the source of Yahuda for this statement, we read 'seventy odd' (*نصف وسبعون*), for which Ibn Hisdai, *מאזני*, 46, 10, puts *חמשה ושבעים*. This is

of some significance, as we would otherwise take seventy as a round number, which plays an important part also in rabbinic literature; comp. Schechter, *אגדת שיר השירים*, Cambridge, 1896, pp. 50–2. A somewhat similar idea is expressed in the phrase *שבעים פנים בתורה* (Midrash rabba to Numbers 7. 19), of which the view ascribed to the prophet may be a modification.

In opposition to the advice of fast walking (*Hidāya*, VI, 10), traced by Yahuda (p. 89, n. 4) to the second Caliph, 'Omar I, Al-Muṭarrif Ibn Al-Shihhār (quoted by Ibn ẖutaiba, '*Uyūn al-'aḥbār*', ed. Brockelmann, p. 375) is related to have admonished his son against immoderate exertion in the discharge of his religious duties, saying that 'the worst kind of journeying is that in which the beast is made to over-exert himself' (شر السير المحققة); comp. *JQR.*, 1910, p. 485, n. 88). Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II, 398, quotes the same saying in the name of Ḥasan Al-Baṣrī (641–727), one of the pillars of Islām. This is in keeping with the *real* meaning of *واقصد في مشيك* 'be moderate in thy pace' (Ḳorān 31. 18). The Talmud, likewise, forbids a *בסיעה גסה*, 'big step' (Ta'anit 10 b). *Abot*, IV, 2 (הוי רץ למצוה), is figurative speech.

Baḥya's beautiful description of the *Zāhid*, or ascetic (*Hidāya*, IX, 5), for which Yahuda (p. 93 f.) quotes parallels from pseudo-'Alī literature, resembles in many points the characterization of the perfect man by Ibn Sīnā; comp. A. F. Mehren, *Vues théosophiques d'Avicenne*, Louvain, 1896, p. 27.

In speaking of the afore-mentioned Ṣūfī Ḥasan Al-Baṣrī as one who recommended the virtue of considering everybody as superior to oneself (p. 98), the author overlooks that the same admonition is given with much additional detail by Baḥya, VI, 10 (*Hidāya*, p. 279, 10).

Mohammed is reported to have praised as a model of piety a certain man who upon rising in the morning declared all the insults he may have to endure during the day at the hands of his fellow-men as forgiven and non-existent (p. 100 f.). This is probably of Jewish origin. In b. Megillah 28 a, it is told of Mar Zuṭra that when he went to bed he used to say every evening

'May God forgive every one who has offended me'. The same is told in a different form of several other teachers of Mishnah and Talmud; see b. Ta'anit, ch. III, near end; Jellinek, *בית המדרש*, II, 68, where the editor's correction of שפתו to מנחתו is a mistake; comp. Ginzberg, *MGWJ.*, LVI (1912), 44. Moreover, on the basis of the Talmudic passages a prayer was adapted and embodied in some of the daily prayer-books (see Baer, *עבודת ישראל*, p. 572) to be recited every evening before going to bed, in which the individual gives general pardon to all who may have sinned against him during the day. That the Mohammedan version has morning in place of evening, is not surprising. The Arabs did not get their knowledge of Jewish matters directly from the original sources, but through occasional conversation with Jews, and they seldom got a thing right. Often they also changed the reports received to suit their own taste (comp. Yahuda, p. 78, no. 1).

* * * *

A considerable number of misprints both in the text and the introduction mar a little the otherwise beautifully printed work. In some instances the author seems to have quoted passages of Bible and Talmud from memory, which caused inaccuracies. Here only some of the more irksome mistakes may be pointed out.

P. 32, 9, read וחתולו. P. 42, 17, read רצו, instead of רצו. P. 44, n. 8, read: 'T. las אלהים statt אללה'. P. 45: note 4 belongs to בשבילו, line 4 of the text. P. 46, n. 2, read זכר. P. 56, last line, read Barlaam und *Joasaf*. P. 59, n. 2, beginning, read 'Abd-al-Qâhir. P. 75, first line of the note from p. 74 read 'oben p. 54, note 2'. *Ibid.*, l. 13, read Qidduschin 22 b. P. 83, n. 2: the passage is not in 'Midrasch rabba zu Gen. 43', but in Talmud Berakot, 43 b. P. 84, n. 1, l. 11: here again the passage is not in 'Midrasch rabba zu Gen. 34' (*sic!*). *Ibid.*, n. 2, l. 3, place العُجْب after أكبر, before 'Variante'. P. 85, n. 1: the sentence quoted from Sotah 5 a, does not occur there in the form given by the author. *Ibid.*, n. 2 (p. 86): a verse ישרים ירשעים ישלום בהם does not exist; the author probably had in mind Hosea 14. 10. P. 86, n. 1, last line, read *Zeitschrift für hebr.* P. 87, l. 3 from below read 'רצו, 3 von unten', instead of 'רצו, 10'. One misses

here also a reference to the passage in Ḳiddushin, 31 a גדול מצוה ועושה. P. 95, n. 2: 'Aboth des Rabbi Nathan, 28' does not bear out the author's contention, as no numbers are given in that passage. The elaborate form of the Baraita is in Ḳiddushin 49 b; Esther rabba, I, § 17. *Ibid.*, last line of the note, read '*Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft*—274'. P. 97, n. 2 of p. 96, for Hudaifer read Hudaifa. P. 103, 10, read Muṭarrif. *Ibid.*, n. 1, line on 1, read حقيقة. P. 110, 16, and n. 1, line 9; it is not obvious to which works of Rosin and Reifmann the author refers. Text, p. 81, letter f: the passage as here quoted is not in Meg. 18 a (not 18 b), but Jerush. Berakot, XI, beginning. P. 226, n. 5, mention should have been made that לא השכמתי in the Hebrew editions near the end of שער הבטחון is meaningless and must be read לא השכמתי = لم أصيح; comp. the discussion of that passage, Introduction, p. 96, n. 1.

HENRY MALTER.

Dropsie College.